

who came to worship, and to make their offerings unto the Lord. A wealthy, aristocratic Pharisee came that way, and while the eyes of the multitude were fixed upon him, he draws forth his heavy purse, and takes from it several gold pieces of considerable value, and drops them into the chest at the door of the temple, he enters and busies himself with his devotions, while the multitude speak his praises for the liberality. Soon another person is seen coming, not followed by liveried servants who attend to her every wish, but alone she draws near, clad in mourning, for she was a widow; watching an opportunity when but few people might see her, she drops into the chest—a penny; no need for her to draw out her purse, it was empty; the last penny had been given to God. The great, good man, even Jesus, looks round upon his disciples, not to applaud the act of the Pharisee, but to declare to them that the widow's penny weighed heavier in the scales of heaven, than all the gifts of her predecessor; for out of his abundance, he had given much, but from improper motives, while she from an almost empty purse had given all, trusting to God for the future.

There are many localities in which the people have not privileges as we have them. They are overwhelmed in such a sea of ignorance and superstition as would shock us, shall we send to them the Bread of life, and teach their erring feet the road, leading into heaven and God? If we are thankful for our blessings, we surely will assist in bestowing the same upon them. First repeat from the heart.

"Our Father who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors; lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil, for thine is the power and the glory forever, Amen." Allow your conscience to dictate the amount you should give to the Lord, and then give it; and when at the end of the world the wicked shall vainly try to hide from the presence of Him who sitteth upon the throne, and shall cry for the rocks and mountains to fall upon them; when the earth shall be rolled up as a scroll; when old things have passed away, and all things have become new; when the nations of earth shall be gathered before God to judgment if you have done your part, you need have no fears in coming before the judgment seat of God, for ere your time shall have come, the crown of life will be in readiness for you, and you may come rejoicing bringing in the sheaves from the harvest field of life.

The Old Dispensation a Type of the New.

A REPLY TO A VERY ERRONEOUS INTERPRETATION OF A VERY PLAIN TEXT WHICH WAS INTENDED TO SHOW THAT IMMERSION WAS NOT GOSPEL BAPTISM.

TEXT:—Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the clouds, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink of the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ. 1 Cor. 10:1-4.

The history of the Jews is a peculiar mixture of fact and prophecy. Every important event in the experience of this chosen family was a prophecy and type of a grander event in the future. The New Testament began in the Old Testament, and the Old Testament was consummated in the New. But in reconciling the types of the Old Testament with the antitypes of the New we must be careful lest we commit mistakes that may lead us astray. Paul frequently calls our attention to the types of the old dispensation and the antitype of the new, and how grandly and minutely they harmonize. But sometimes when the type and antitype are mentioned definitely in connection with each other, we form a very erroneous and narrow idea of the antitype, and we then have to explain the type so that our view of the antitype will be substantiated. Are you sure you understand the idea I am trying to convey in my last sentence? We contract narrow and wrong ideas about a certain doctrine. Paul refers to this doctrine and explains it by saying that it is the antitype of a certain event in the history of the Jews; or in other words, the certain

event in the history of the Jews was the type of a certain Christian doctrine. Now, if any one entertains a wrong idea of the doctrine, it is easy to see how they would have to twist matters around to suit the circumstances. When any one undertakes to bolster up a wrong idea of any of the teachings of Christ, there must be a great deal of misinterpretation and misapplication, for the whole teachings of the Bible are so dovetailed and interwoven together that they will not admit of any deviation. We had an instance of this misinterpretation on last Sunday, when the minister of one of our neighboring churches undertook to prove the *mode* of Christian baptism from the above text. It is already fresh in the memories of those of you who heard it, and for the edification of those who were not there to hear it, I will repeat the brother's argument.

He inferred very positively, from the text that I have read to you, that *baptism was not immersion*. He said, however, in a spirit of condescension, that "Immersion may be baptism," still that there may be baptism where there was no immersion. He argued that the Egyptians in the case referred to, that is when they followed the Israelites through the Red Sea, no doubt were immersed, and perished by their immersion; but it is not called a baptism. This, no doubt, was meant as a caricature upon immersion as baptism. Then, he continued, the Israelites passed through an open pathway between the divided waters, and walked "upon dry land in the midst of the sea," and did not so much as wet their feet; "Yet," said the minister, "The Apostle pronounces it a baptism." And he quotes, to substantiate his theory, they "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

It is very strange that the brother never explained how they were "baptized unto Moses in the cloud." He was very anxious to have a dry baptism and so omitted all reference to the "cloud." This text has often been quoted as an evidence that baptism is not immersion, and I am glad of the opportunity of defending the apostolic mode of Christian baptism from the assaults of those who would subvert the plain teachings of Jesus. I am also glad that I can this morning talk to the majority of those who heard the arguments against immersion, or, I might truthfully say, "baptism." How eager are those, who have to depend upon borrowed or supposed ideas, to jump at conclusions that suit their purpose. In the study of the Bible and its teachings we must discriminate between fact and metaphor. That a minister of the Gospel will risk his reputation as a scholar and a fair-minded man in trying to prove that baptism is not immersion is something I cannot understand. I look upon it as an insult to the intelligence of the community.

When we are going to interpret any portion of Scripture, we should always enter into the spirit and idea of the writer, and not isolate a word or a sentence from the general reading to suit our purpose. In the instance before us we have a metaphor or figure, by which Paul plainly and beautifully sets forth the *DESIGN* and not the *form* of baptism. How does our brother quote the first verse of this text? Let us read it *as it is*, and not as he would have it. Paul in the previous chapter has been strongly emphasizing the stern necessity of sacrifice, submission, and energy in the Christian life—that Christianity cannot exist without these qualifications. Then he goes on to say, "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were UNDER the cloud, and all passed THROUGH the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses IN the cloud and IN the sea." Paul assumes they were *under* the cloud and that they passed *through* the sea; this implies, at once, without the necessity of argument, what baptism is. Here is immersion without any quibbling. Paul does not refer to their passing over the river bed dry shod, but takes the circumstance in a broader sense, and speaks of the Israelites passing *through* the sea, and being *under* the cloud, thus it becomes in his eyes literally a type of the form of baptism. Paul was far from being a dry shod baptist. He was calling to mind the fact that they passed *through* the sea, or the water, which we all have to do if we

go to the Lord through baptism. We want the brother to mark his Bible here, that it was *through* the water and *under* the cloud that the Israelites were baptized unto Moses: This is what baptism means—an overwhelming. The case under consideration is a clear case of immersion.

They were "baptized unto Moses," we are told. This is a very peculiar expression, and is often met with in the Scripture. The expression implies more than the simple words mean in our English way of speaking. It may have been an idiom peculiar to the Eastern countries, especially to the Greek language. We are in the New Testament language "baptized unto (or into) Christ." The Israelites were led by Moses. It was in obedience to his command they passed *through* the sea. It was under his leadership, and through his intercession that they were *under* the cloud. The cloud and the sea protected and covered them from danger. "Under the cloud," and "through the sea," they were safe from their enemies. Thus the design of baptism was brought out. As long as they followed Moses, obeyed his commands, and remained under the cloud, and passed through the sea, they were safe.

While we could insist on these words referring to the *mode* of baptism, and we might argue that the Israelites being "under" the cloud, implies a true case of immersion, and that the expression of Paul when he says, "all passed *through* the sea," was intended to teach immersion, yet while we could consistently say and prove all this, we do not think we would be getting at the direct meaning of Paul's expression. So we see how ridiculous it is to attempt to prove a dry baptism from this text or circumstance. Paul does not refer to the passing over dry shod. This is the unwarranted and unauthorized assertion of our brother in his eagerness to prove a dry baptism; but the apostle, on the contrary, refers to the Israelites as passing *through* the sea, which was virtually the fact. How far-fetched and foolish are the arguments when ministers will attempt to prove that sprinkling or pouring is baptism. This argument of the brother reminds one of what another minister used once in reference to this text—that as the Israelites were passing over the Red Sea, the water being elevated on both sides of them, that the spray sprinkled them, so Paul referred to this as a type of baptism, so sprinkling was baptism. But the trouble in both instances is that the words of the apostle "under" and "through" spoils their theory. I suppose the brother will admit that all are baptized *with* water—that is that water is the element to be used in baptism, and if he will permit me to put him *under* and *through* the water, we will be very apt to get a clear case of immersion, and we will not get through dryshod.

But we want to refer to the *design*. Paul implies here it was a *baptism of deliverance*. It put the sea and the cloud between the Israelites and danger. So long as they remained under the protection of the cloud they were safe. And when they had passed *through* the Red Sea, they were beyond the power of their enemies. What a beautiful figure of the redeemed soul getting away from the bondage of sin under the protection of Jesus. Moses led the Jews through the Red Sea. So does Jesus lead us through the waters of baptism. They were baptized unto Moses, that is under his instruction and leadership. So, too, are we baptized unto Christ, under his instruction and leadership we pass through the waters of baptism.

It was a *baptism unto a radical change*. To the Jews it was the transition state unto a new existence. It was passing from Africa into Asia—from bondage to freedom—from Pharaoh to God. It was the beginning of a new era to them—a regeneration. This is the doctrine Jesus taught Nicodemus—the doctrine of a new birth. Wherever we turn in the Apostles' epistles, we are taught the great principle of a new existence, of which baptism is the door.

We would be willing to leave the decision of this matter to the good sense and intelligence of the people right here, without any further argument, but for another assertion of our brother,

(Concluded on 6th page.)